

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application.
The Office Action and cited references have been considered.
Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes the requirement for a substitute specification including the claims, abstract and drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that this requirement is unnecessary and inappropriate. Applicant notes that an abstract was filed with the application on December 31, 2001. In addition, drawings were attached as part of the WO specification. The WO specification is the appropriate specification in this case and should have been sufficient for the PTO's purposes. Amendments were presented to that specification in the form of substitute sheets submitted by the Applicant in connection with the PCT application. Again these substitute sheets, including the sheets for a new claim, should have been sufficient to make the appropriate amendments. However, in order to avoid a dispute about this requirement, applicant is submitting herewith substitute drawings, a new abstract, a new specification, and amendments to the claims. The specification is presented without the claims as is appropriate under the PTO rules. Amendments to the claims are submitted in a separate section as required by the MPEP. The amendments to the specification comprise corrections to typographical errors noted during review, as well as the changes made by the amended sheets submitted in the PCT

application. Applicant respectfully submits that this specification does not contain any new matter. In light of this submission, withdrawal of the requirement is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 was objected to due to an informality noted in the Office Action. The claim has been amended. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Piasecki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,117,453). Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-13 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Sicher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,084). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a digital telecommunication station operative in a telecommunication network. The station includes at least one detector operative to receive at least two different types of signals and determine their type, at least one switch controlled by one of the at least one detector, operative to channel signals received in accordance with the determination made by the one of the at least one detector, a first transmission means operative to transmit the received signals along a first transmission path, wherein signals of at least one type may be diverted from the first transmission path along which signals of the other types are transmitted, and a second transmission means operative to transmit the diverted signals of

signals of the at least one type along a second transmission path. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

According to the present claimed invention, a digital communication station operative to receive different types of signals is provided with means to distinguish between these different types of signals. Based on the type of the signals thus distinguished, the station is able to transmit signals along a path that is appropriate for the signals' type. Consequently, two different types of signals, even if they are to be transmitted to the same remote address, are transmitted along different paths to that remote address, thus allowing the various signals' transmission to be carried out along a corresponding path that better suits the system's requirements and constraints.

In contrast to the present claimed invention, Piasecki teaches the detection of facsimile signals from among other voiceband (VBD) signals, and upon their detection, demodulates them. In other words, Piasecki does not teach the diversion of facsimile signals to allow their transmission along a communication path different from the one along which the rest of the VBD signals are transmitted. Instead, Piasecki concerns how to affect different processing of the facsimile signals when various VBD signals (including facsimile signals) arrive at the same location. Furthermore, Piasecki is also concerned with how to distinguish between signals which belong to the same type of

signals, i.e. VBD signals, which is of course, not the problem that the present invention seeks to solve.

Similarly, Sicher et al. is concerned with a completely different problem and provides a completely different solution to that problem. This patent is concerned with "simultaneously conducting a data transfer and a voice call between a mobile station and a...mobile switching center" (lines 1-4 of the abstract). In other words, the problem with which Sicher is concerned is how to allow the transfer of two different types of signals (voice and data) along the same transmission path. In order to address this problem, the solution provided by Sicher comprises means for encapsulating the two types of signals, where "said means for encapsulating including means for multiplexing said DSVD source signal and the line negotiation protocols into a single voice channel" (Col 13, lines 24-27).

In contrast to the teachings of the prior art discussed above, Applicant's claimed invention recites, among other things, a first transmission means operative to transmit the received signals along the first transmissions path, wherein signals of at least one type selected from among the at least two different types of signals are diverted from the first transmission path along with signals of the other types of transmitted, and a second transmission means operative to transmit the diverted signals of at least one type long second

Appln. No. 10/019,558
Amd. dated January 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2005

transmission path. This feature, along with other features claimed in the combination, not taught or disclosed by the cited prior art. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2-15 depend from and include the recitations of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-15 are patentable in and of themselves and as they depend from and include the recitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By Ronni Jillions
Ronni Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:pap:kg
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\E\eci\Guatal\PTO\Amd 25JAN06.doc

Anet M. Kornbau
Reg. No. 25,884